DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 230 909 CS 007 180

AUTHOR Hannon, Ann A.
TITLE A Comparison of a Single Basal Series System with a Tri-Basal Series System.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 34p.; M.A. Thesis, Kean College of New Jersey.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Dissertations/Theses - Master Theses (042)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Basal Reading; *Comparative Analysis; Elementary Education; Grade 2; Grade 5; Longitudinal Studies; Program Effectiveness; *Reading Achievement; Reading Improvement; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Research; Textbooks

ABSTRACT

A study compared the reading achievement over 3 years of a group of elementary school students taught to read by means of a single-basal system and one taught by means of a tri-basal system. Subjects were 34 current sixth grade students from a school that uses the Ginn "Reading 720" series, representing two or more grade levels, for all students regardless of ability; and 51 current sixth grade students in a school that uses three different series: the "Bookmark Reading Program" for high ability students, the Ginn "Reading 720" series for average readers, and the Economy "Keytext" series for low ability students. The second and fifth grade standardized reading test scores of each student were examined, and scores on a cognitive abilities test were compared and used as indicators of verbal intelligence. The results indicated that the single-basal system group performed significantly better in the second grade, but that both groups performed equally well in the fifth grade. (Tables of comparative data are appended.) (FL)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

834

ED230909

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ann A. Hannon

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

# A COMPARISON OF A SINGLE BASAL SERIES SYSTEM WITH A TRI-BASAL SERIES SYSTEM

by

ANN A. HANNON

Accepted 3/23/83

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the Master of Arts degree in Education at Kean College of New Jersey April 1983

CS 007 180

## ABSTRACT

The study of two sample groups, totalling eighty-five elementary school students, was done to compare the relative effectiveness of a tri-basal reading system with a single-basal reading system. Reading achievement was measured and compared when the subjects were in the second grade and when they were in the fifth grade.

The results indicated that the single-basal sample group performed significantly better in the second grade but that both sample groups performed equally well in the fifth grade.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| I. | ABSTRACT | i |
| II. | TRI-BASAL SERIES USE VS. SINGLE BASAL SERIES USE | |
| | Introduction | 1 |
| | Hypothesis | 3 |
| | Definitions | 3 |
| | Procedures | 4 |
| | Results | 5 |
| | Conclusions and Implications | 8 |
| III. | RELATED RESEARCH | 11 |
| IV. | BIBLIOGRAPHY | 23 |
| V. | APPENDIX | 25 |

## INTRODUCTION

The organization and management of reading programs has taxed the resources of school personnel since public education was initiated in our country in 1647. Robert B. Ruddell (1974) presents a brief background on grouping for instruction, from the one-room schoolhouse through various graded systems, from which evolved the most common form of organization used today, a multi-group reading system, usually three in the primary grades and two or three in the intermediate grades. The three group system, based on reading ability, is promoted by the teacher manuals which accompany the basal texts.

The first reading basal was introduced in 1836 by William H. McGuffey, the author of the Eclectic Readers, which eventually sold over one million copies. Since then the number of basal systems in use has proliferated until now, according to Jean S. Chall (1967) four out of five of the approximately twenty million children enrolled in grades one to six learn to read by means of the standard basal reader and its component parts. The Austin-Morrison study (1963) indicated that 95 percent of their sampled schools relied heavily on basal reading programs. Although there are many objections voiced to both the three-group system and to published reading systems, it appears that both will be with us for a number of years longer.

The use of standard basal systems requires the expenditure of great amounts of money, time, and effort. Those responsible for the selection have a very difficult task: choosing the "best" for their population from among many equally good ones. Witty, Freeland, and Grotberg (1964) state that during the period from 1930 to 1950 some schools started to adopt two or more separate basals. Albert J. Harris (1969) also found that many school systems use one basal series for low groups, another for middle groups, and a third for high groups. The reasons given for the purchase of co-basals or tri-basals are discussed by Harris (1969), Paul S. Anderson (1956), and John W. Miller (1981). One advantage is that each achievement level group is taught by a method chosen specifically for it. Another is the fact that children are less aware of their reading level, resulting in less damage to the self concept of the children in the slower groups. A third advantage is the elimination of the repetition of stories, overheard by the slower groups.

Harris, Anderson, and Miller also cite some disadvantages in using co-basals and tri-basals. Teachers may lose track of the skills covered in each group; temporary transfers to a slower group because of extended absence are impossible; and transfer to a higher group is difficult because of a different vocabulary and sequencing of skills. There are also the problems of additional purchase costs,

storage, and clerical duties.

As school boards scrutinize their budgets more caretully they will no doubt look for justification for the purchase of more than one basal series. However, there is little published information on the comparative benefits of using a single basal, co-basal, or tri-basal system in teaching children to read. The lack of emperical data is puzzling, considering the number of children learning to read through use of basals, and the enormous amount of money, time, and effort expended in the acquisition and use of these materials. This paper will attempt to compare the reading achievement of a group of students taught to read by means of a single basal, with that of a similar group taught by means of a tri-basal system.

## HYPOTHESIS

The reading achievement of children, as measured by their scores on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills over a three year period, will show no significant difference between those children instructed in a single basal system and those instructed in a tri-basal system.

## DEFINITIONS

Basal: A published basic reading program designed to teach children to read, usually used in grades one to six.

Tri-basal system The adoption of three basals, one to be used for each achievement level in a classroom or school.

Iowa Test of Basic Skills: A formal, nationally normed, group administered achievement test, widely used in schools.

Cognitive Abilities Test-Verbal Battery: A formal, nationally normed, group administered test, widely used to measure verbal intelligence.

Standard Age Score (SAS): This is a normalized standard score with a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 16.

## PROCEDURES

Sample I was composed of fifty-one of the current sixth grade students in one Middletown, New Jersey school which employs a tri-basal system. Each of the students in the sample had attended that school from the beginning of the first grade through the end of the fifth grade. The three basal series in use were: The Bookmark Reading Program for the high ability group, the Ginn Reading 720 for the average ability group, and the Economy Keytext for the low ability group. Students had only been transferred between groups if they were identified as having special needs.

Sample II was composed of thirty-four of the current sixth grade students from another Middletown, New Jersey school which employs a single basal system for all its students regardless of ability. Each classroom uses two or more grade levels of the same series to meet the needs of

students with a range of reading abilities. The basal series in use was the Ginn Reading 720. All the sampled students had started in that series in first grade and had remained in it through the end of fifth grade.

The two schools chosen were similar in population number, class sizes, and education and experience of the teachers. In addition, they were located in areas of similar socio-economic conditions.

The standardized test records of each child were examined. The scores used in this study were the vocabulary and reading scores on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills given to the sample populations in March 1979, when they were in the second grade, and in March 1982, when they were in the fifth grade. Their Standard Age Scores on the verbal battery of the Cognitive Abilities Test, given in March 1979, were compared and used as indicators of verbal intelligence.

Mean grade-equivalent scores were determined for each sample on each of the reading tests. The mean reading scores of both populations in grade two and grade five were compared. Critical Ratio tests were used to determine the significance of differences between the sample means on both verbal intelligence and reading tests.

## RESULTS

The vocabulary and reading comprehension grade-equivalent scores for each of the students in Sample I and in

Sample II are listed in the appendix. The scores given are derived from the Iowa Test of Basic Skills administered in March 1979, when the subjects were in the second grade, and in March 1982, when they were in the fifth grade. Also listed are the Standard Age Scores from the verbal battery of the Cognitive Abilities Test administered in March 1979, and used as a measurement of verbal intelligence.

Sample I is composed of students taught to read in a tri-basal school; Sample II is composed of students taught in a single-basal school. A t test was used to determine the significance of difference between the sample means in verbal intelligence. The results of this test are presented in Table I.

Table I

Cognitive Abilities Test, Verbal Battery

| | N | M | SD | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sample I | 51 | 109.82 | 14.78 | 0.117 |
| Sample II | 34 | 110.18 | 13.37 | |

The results indicate that there was no significant difference between the mean verbal intelligence scores of the two Samples at the outset of the study.

t tests were also used to measure the level of significance of differences between grade-equivalent mean scores of

both sample groups on the Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension subtests. The results of the pretest taken in the second grade are presented in Table II, and the results of the posttest, taken in the fifth grade, are presented in Table III.

Table II

ITBS Pretest, Grade 2

| | N | M | SD | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vocabulary | | | | |
| Sample I | 51 | 3.36 | 1.01 | 2.12 |
| Sample II | 34 | 3.81 | 0.93 | |
| Comprehension | | | | |
| Sample I | 51 | 3.36 | 1.30 | 2.63 |
| Sample II | 34 | 4.08 | 1.20 | |

The Vocabulary subtest data indicates that the difference of .45 between the two mean grade-equivalent scores is significant below the .05 level of significance at the outset of the study.

In Comprehension the difference of .72 grades between the two means is significant below the .01 level of significance, indicating that the difference in mean scores is unlikely to have happened by chance.

An indication of the relative standing of the two

samples at the end of the study is seen in the results given in Table III.

Table III

ITBS Posttest, Grade 5

| | N | M | SD | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vocabulary | | | | |
| Sample I | 51 | 6.60 | 1.25 | 0.88 |
| Sample II | 34 | 6.82 | 1.05 | |
| Comprehension | | | | |
| Sample I | 51 | 6.62 | 1.42 | 0.87 |
| Sample II | 34 | 7.08 | 1.16 | |

Although non-significant differences still exist in favor of the single basal approach, the results of the fifth grade posttest indicate that the differences between the two sample groups in both Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension could have resulted by chance, and that the use of one approach or the other makes relatively little difference.

## CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

It would seem from the results of this study that the use of several levels of a single basal series, as opposed to tri-basals, is related to higher reading achievement by March of the second grade. The results also suggest that this advantage diminishes until it reaches an insignificant

level by March of the fifth grade.

Since both sample groups were very similar in verbal intelligence, and since their experiental backgrounds and socio-economic situations, according to the school staffs, were very similar, the similarities and differences of their school experiences from kindergarten to grade two need to be examined.

The school district administrators had made a concerted effort to balance the schools in class size, materials, experience and number of supervisors and support personnel, education and experience of teachers, and supplementary remedial and enrichment programs. It is the judgement of the researcher that a reasonable balance was achieved.

A thorough longitudinal study certainly would have uncovered many differences between the school experiences of the two sample groups, some minor and some considerable. However, the most obvious difference was the use of a single basal series as opposed to multiple series.

Several implications may be drawn from the apparent advantage of single basal series use in the early primary grades, where word attack is the chief objective of the reading program. Stewart (1957) pointed out that changes from one group to another "can create gaps in skill sequence." The children in the tri-basal school did indeed move between series several times in kindergarten, first, and second grades. This was done in an effort to find the

"best" series for the child. Harris (1970) suggested that, "when the series chosen are quite different in their teaching plans, the teacher may lose track of the skills covered in each group." It should be noted that all the classrooms in the two samples employed the Wisconsin Design of Word Attack, which did provide some unity of skills management.

Another factor to consider is the possible inequality of effectiveness of the basals themselves for early reading instruction. It may also be that the authors of the Reading 720 program more closely addressed those skills measured by the ITBS.

Based on the data given, the original hypothesis must be rejected. It should again be noted, however, that by fifth grade the reading achievements of both sample groups were comparable.

BASAL SERIES: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

## BASAL SERIES: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Grouping for reading instruction began in our country with the establishment of the one-room schoolhouse. Dan T. Dawson (1955) pointed out that the teacher of the one-room school necessarily accepted the fact that he had to provide for individual differences because there was no other way to cope with the problem of a wide range of ages and ability. Sometimes assignments were individual and sometimes they were done by small groups working together. Often, according to Robert B. Ruddell (1974), the older or more able students were used to teach the younger ones, and to hear them recite their lessons.

In 1848 the graded system based on age categories came into being, making somewhat more provision for individual differences. Ruddell stated that:

> Some educators soon became aware that the graded system was only a partial answer to meeting children's needs and, as conceived, was unfair and frustrating to certain students. The concept, however had been so well received by parents and teachers that any change was met with strong resistance, so attempts were made to provide for individual differences within the graded classroom structure. One was the multiple reading group program.

Ruddell then presented a description of various grouping plans, including the Joplin Plan, XYZ Grouping, and various non-graded plans, including the Cambridge Plan, the Winnetka Plan, and the Dalton Laboratory Plan. He concluded that the grade level, heterogeneous classroom, using the

three group system of ability grouping, is the method most widely used and most favored by administrations, parents, and teachers. The advantages of this plan, as given by Jean Turner Goins (1957), are that "each child is allowed to progress sequentially and at his own rate," and that the teacher is freed for planning time because of the "independence that children quickly develop when they are using materials geared to their true instructional level."

Goins also pointed out several disadvantages. One is that the teacher must spend additional time in preparation and instruction when there are several reading groups. Also, "the group loses the feeling of unity and the value of the stimulation that comes when all the children are working on and discussing, a common theme."

According to Richard J. Smith and Dale D. Johnson (1976) the principle criticism of the three-group approach is its "rigidity." They suggest that few students move out of a particular group; that students in the low group in first grade usually remain in the low group throughout the elementary school years. They also suggest that because these children spend more time on drill and skill work, their interest in reading dissipates, and they achieve the expectations set for them. Nevertheless, the three-group plan will be with us for many more years, at least as long as commercially published reading manuals outline that plan as a preferred management system.

The basal reader itself had its origins in the same one-room schools. Noah Webster's The American Spelling Book in 1783 emphasized letter-sound relationships and syllable pronounciation. Its content reflected the patriotism and morality of the post-revolutionary period.

Then in 1836, McGuffey published the first of his graded Eclectic Readers, and for approximately forty years that series was the prime instrument used in the teaching of reading. By the turn of the century other publishers started to produce basal reading materials and, according to Ruddell, played an important instructional role. Ruddell conducts an interesting itinerary through the various stages of basal program development, from the awareness of a "reading readiness" in the 1920's and 1930's, to the emphasis on sight vocabulary in the 1940's, and through the "lay critic" period of the 1950's. Notable innovations in the 1960's were linguistic readers and reformed orthography. This brings us to the present basal reading programs with their wide variety of materials, their combination of decoding skills and controlled high frequency vocabulary, and their comprehension and study skill materials.

William Page (1978) defined a basal reading series, not as mere books, but as a system.

> At its heart is an anthology. Stories are written, adapted and selected, bound in separate books usually designated by grade level, and assumed to progress from easy to hard according to the designated grade levels. A basal series often includes consumable workbooks, pre-tests,

> supplemental phonics and word recognition programs, enrichment readers, games, correlated skills instruction materials, management and record keeping devices, storage boxes, and nearly always -- a teacher's manual.

Jean Chall (1967) commented also on the bulk of an entire basal program, suggesting that she would have needed a storage room in order to analyze one complete program. She was also greatly impressed with the widespread use of basal reading systems, stating that "for all practical purposes American reading instruction is basal series reading instruction." The Austin-Morrison study (1963) indicated that ninety-five percent of the schools sampled relied heavily on some form of basal reading programs.

These facts illustrate the powerful influence the publishing industry has on the reading curriculum. Unfortunately, as suggested by Page, "Marketing principles may outweigh educational principles in the construction of a basal reader." That suggestion is supported by the fact that Chall was told in 1966 by a series publisher that a full reading system for kindergarten through grade six represented an investment by the publisher of about twenty-five million dollars. One of the marketing principles cited by Page was the goal of publishers to have their basal reading systems meet the curriculum goals of those states which employ statewide adoption of texts.

That policy gives rise to one frequently made criticism of basals: the objectives of the basals often do not match

the reading objectives of the school districts, which must then supplement the reading program with other skill management programs, either commercial or district-made.

Basals have also been criticized for their indirect discrimination against minority groups and women. Smith and Johnson point out some of the "isms" unrealistically presented in stories, but they feel that "in the newest basal series published, authors and editors have demonstrated a much sharper sensitivity about racism, ethnicism, and sexism." They say nothing about agism.

Smith and Johnson also note that while photography and manipulation of print have somewhat increased the interest level of basal stories, often uninteresting stories are produced as a result of a "gradual, sequential, repetitive introduction of high frequency words." Witty, Freeland and Grotberg (1966) concur that there is excessive repetition of words already known by the child.

Despite these criticisms there is general agreement among teachers, administrators, and other reading experts that "our most effective tool is the properly used basic reading series," according to David N. Stewart (1957), who adds, "That basal readers produce desirable outcomes is an established fact." It is also generally agreed that there is no one best method of utilizing basal readers.

One variation of the standard basal reading programs is the use in some districts of more than one series in a

classroom. According to Witty, Freeland and Grotberg, co-basals came into use during the period from 1930 to 1950. Ralph C. Staiger reported in 1958 that of the 474 schools in his sample, more than thirty percent used co-basals or tri-basals. Since then the practice may have increased.

As with all programs, the advantages must be weighed against the disadvantages. Proponents of multi-basal use, John DeBoer and Martha Dallmann (1960) suggest that, "reliance should not be placed upon a single basal reader for the whole class; indeed it should not be placed upon an entire single series."

Albert J. Harris (1970) feels that if there are middle and high groups in a classroom, the high group should use a comparatively difficult basal reader intended for that grade. He cites the advantage that "no group has heard a story read and discussed by another group before getting to it." However, he also points out that, "if the series are quite different in their teaching plans, the teacher may lose track of the skills covered in each group, and transfers of children from one group to another are more difficult."

Those same issues had been raised by Paul S. Anderson in 1956, and by Daniel K. Stewart in 1957. Anderson named several advantages in using one basal series: the value of repetition, the unity of skills presentation, and the comparative ease of transfer between groups. He also

reported some justification of multi-basal use: less inter-group competition and a less monotonous day for the teacher. More importantly, he notes that, "different types of children respond to different methods of instruction."

Stewart addressed the problem of children overhearing another group's lesson. He concedes that it is difficult to develop interest and interpretation skills with a group that has already heard the lesson. Also "perceiving relationships, anticipating outcomes, and drawing inferences are skills that are taught best with fresh material." However, he feels that those problems are not insurmountable; that room dividers and soft voices can overcome that problem. In addition, he feels that the repetition is of value to the teacher, who can concentrate on the children's needs rather than constantly adjusting to different skills presentations. He also mentions the problem of transfer between groups when multi-basals are used.

John Miller (1981) named some unique problems in co-basal adoptions. He does not present them as, "an indictment, . . . .(but) as an advance warning of some of the pitfalls." He also offers suggestions for overcoming those problems. The first problem deals with the sales presentation. Since the sales representative would try to sell his series as a complete program, he should be advised in advance to focus on the features of his series that would make it a valuable part of a co-basal adoption. Then, when

the selection committee makes the decision on either single basal or co-basal adoption, it must do so on educationally justifiable grounds, not as a compromise between two equally good series. The amounts ordered must allow for transfers between groups, and decisions must be made concerning which component parts to order. Placement of children at levels within a series and between series must be carefully considered, keeping in mind the reasons used for the co-basal adoption. Advancement within and between series must similarly be considered. Finally, the management of skill instruction in a new co-basal adoption requires the consultant services of the publishing company. Miller also advises those teachers to follow their manuals closely until they are very familiar with the material.

Several comparisons have been made between the skills programs of different series. Stewart found that, "the sequence of presentation of the skills program is not precisely parallel in any two of the popular reading series, but all agree upon objectives and purposes." Chall was told by an author that his basal series was, "pretty much the same as three or four leading basals. They are alike in that they have a controlled vocabulary through the sixth grade, and a three or four strand program concentrating on (1) developing a sight vocabulary, (2) a word analysis skills program, which is eclectic, (3) comprehension and critical thinking, (4) study skills starting at the third grade level."

There appear to be at least as many problems as benefits inherent in the use of more than one basal series. It may be wise to examine three series, used by the populations in this study, for evidence of features which might make them uniquely suitable for the achievement levels for which they were purchased.

The EPIE Institute Report 82m indicates that both the Bookmark Reading Program and the Reading 720 were intended for use with almost all children in a regular elementary classroom, kindergarten through grade six. Both provide for a balance of word attack, word meaning, comprehension skills, literature appreciation, some study skills, critical thinking, and oral reading. Both are linear programs, and both employ eclectic methodology.

However, The Bookmark Reading Program does have one feature which may make it more suitable for a high achievement group: that is its intermediate grade literature readers which accompany the regular reader. The EPIE report also states the following:

> The apparent difficulty of the material prompted one analyst to comment that while the program is supposed to meet the needs of the individual learner and is purported to be adaptable to any teaching style, it appears to be most appropriate for learners who experience few learning difficulties.

In addition, the Report from Users states that forty-nine percent of responding users said "no" to the question, "Does this material give directions your students can follow with

no more than occasional help from you?"

The EPIE report on Reading 720 quotes the publisher's statement:

> Reading 720 is designed to be used in typical classrooms and with all pupils except those who have identifiable mental, sensory, or learning handicaps, or do not have normal command of the English language.

In response to the same question, "Does this material give directions your students can follow with no more than occasional help from you?" only one percent replied "no." It would seem that Reading 720 is appropriate for all but the lowest achievers, but perhaps is not as challenging to high achievers as the Bookmark Reading Program.

Observations by Samuel A. Kirk in 1949 are equally valid today. He found that the poorer readers were usually given reading materials a little above their reading ability in an attempt to have them work near the average. He believed that slow learners need systematic instruction in reading; they would not pick up reading incidentally through other activities. He felt nothing in word attack should be left to chance. Slow learners need direct teacher instruction in sight vocabulary, letter-sound correspondence, context clues, and structural analysis.

These observations by Kirk do suggest the need for a teaching instrument or method beyond the range of Reading 720 or The Bookmark Program. The Keytext Program claims to be unique in its methodology. It is a spiral type program,

has a strong phonics base, and makes much use of language experience and aural comprehension. The publisher states:

> The Keytext Program is a complete basal reading series designed to meet the needs of those students who are experiencing difficulty learning to read. The fourteen levels of the program accommodate six years of instruction in reading, but at a slower pace and with greater scope than most basal reading series.

The publisher points out that the readability levels of the texts are one grade below the suggested grade use.

The teacher's manual states that the reasons for reading problems are varied but seem to fall into three major categories: pacing, experience, and motivation. The publishers do seem to have addressed all three categories in their series. Use of the Keytext Program requires one practice which may contribute more to the success of the program than any which the publisher mentions: that is the amount of time the teacher must spend directly instructing the children. There is almost no independent seatwork.

Certainly there is common agreement that disabled readers require more than one third of the teacher's time in a reading period. However, if the teacher spent the extra time with the lower readers, but in the same series as the other groups and at the appropriate readability level, also using supplementary phonics material, equal or superior success might be achieved.

In summary, both achievement level grouping and basal readers have developed, through need, over a long period of

time. They will likely remain with us for many more years. Co-basals and tri-basals have become fairly common features of reading programs, but have received very little attention from reading experts. The problems inherent in the adoption and use of a multi-basal program need to be justified by evidence that gains in reading result from the use of basals chosen specifically for each achievement level group. If there is no gain in reading ability with the use of multi-basals, then teachers and administrators need to examine the reasons for their purchase.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Austin, Mary C. and Coleman Morrison. The First R: The Harvard Report on Reading in Elementary Schools. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1963.

"The Bookmark Reading Program: Second Edition." EPIE Report, 82m. New York: EPIE Institute, 1977.

Chall, Jean. Learning to Read: The Great Debate. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Dawson, Dan T. "Some Issues in Grouping for Reading." The National Elementary Principal 35 (April 1955), 48-52.

De Boer, John J. and Martha Dallmann. The Teaching of Reading. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1960.

Goins, Jean Turner. "Effective Uses of Basal Readers," Materials for Reading, Proceedings of the Annual Conference on Reading, Vol. 19, Helen M. Robinson, ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Harris, Albert J. How to Increase Reading Ability. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1970.

Keytext, Oklahoma City: The Economy Company, 1978.

Kirk, Samuel A. Classroom Techniques in Improving Reading, William S. Gray ed. Annual Conference on Reading, University of Chicago, 1949.

Miller, John W. "Cobasal Reading Adoptions Present Unique Problems." Reading Horizons Vol. 21. No. 4 (1981), 244-251.

Page, William D. Teacher's Decisions and Basal Reader Teachers' Manuals. Toronto, Canada: Annual Meeting of The American Educational Research Association, March 1978.

"Reading 720." EPIE Report, 82m. New York: EPIE Institute, 1977.

Ruddell, Robert B. Reading-Language Instruction: Innovative Practices. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, INc., 1974.

Smith, Richard J. and Dale D. Johnson. Teaching Children to Read. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publ. Co., 1976.

Staiger, Ralph C. "How Are Basal Readers Used?" Article 20 in Teaching Reading: Selected Materials, Walter B. Barbe, ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Stewart, David K. "Values and Limitations of Basal Readers," Materials for Reading, Proceedings of the Annual Conference on Reading, Vol. 19, Helen M. Robinson, ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Witty, Paul A., Alma Moore Freeland, and Edith H. Grotberg. The Teaching of Reading. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1966.

# APPENDIX

SAMPLE I

| Subj. | ITBS 1979 | | ITBS 1982 | | Cog. Abil. 1979 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Voc. | Comp. | Voc. | Comp. | |
| 1. | 4.3 | 5.0 | 8.4 | 8.6 | 128 |
| 2. | 3.8 | 3.6 | 6.9 | 6.2 | 117 |
| 3. | 5.0 | 5.7 | 8.0 | 8.2 | 127 |
| 4. | 5.0 | 5.9 | 8.9 | 10.0 | 131 |
| 5. | 1.8 | 1.1 | 4.2 | 4.8 | 85 |
| 6. | 3.4 | 3.1 | 6.0 | 6.2 | 111 |
| 7. | 2.2 | 1.7 | 4.2 | 5.8 | 100 |
| 8. | 4.1 | 4.8 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 114 |
| 9. | 3.9 | 3.1 | 6.7 | 6.0 | 120 |
| 10. | 2.8 | 1.5 | 5.5 | 6.2 | 103 |
| 11. | 4.3 | 5.0 | 8.0 | 8.4 | 119 |
| 12. | 1.6 | 2.1 | 5.4 | 5.1 | 93 |
| 13. | 2.5 | 2.8 | 5.2 | 5.5 | 99 |
| 14. | 5.0 | 5.2 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 121 |
| 15. | 2.2 | 1.9 | 4.6 | 4.7 | 74 |
| 16. | 2.0 | 1.6 | 4.9 | 4.0 | 77 |
| 17. | 3.4 | 4.5 | 7.3 | 6.5 | 108 |
| 18. | 3.9 | 3.9 | 6.9 | 5.7 | 107 |
| 19. | 3.6 | 4.4 | 6.9 | 7.3 | 120 |
| 20. | 3.6 | 2.0 | 6.1 | 6.8 | 113 |
| 21. | 2.5 | 2.1 | 6.9 | 6.1 | 103 |
| 22. | 2.5 | 1.7 | 6.9 | 6.5 | 99 |
| 23. | 3.0 | 3.1 | 6.1 | 6.2 | 104 |
| 24. | 3.4 | 3.4 | 6.5 | 6.0 | 121 |
| 25. | 2.2 | 1.8 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 73 |
| 26. | 2.7 | 3.1 | 6.7 | 5.8 | 111 |
| 27. | 3.8 | 3.4 | 6.7 | 6.5 | 110 |
| 28. | 2.2 | 3.1 | 6.4 | 6.8 | 110 |
| 29. | 3.1 | 3.3 | 6.7 | 6.8 | 116 |
| 30. | 3.0 | 2.5 | 6.1 | 7.2 | 119 |
| 31. | 5.5 | 4.8 | 8.4 | 9.3 | 136 |
| 32. | 4.7 | 4.2 | 8.4 | 8.8 | 127 |
| 33. | 4.7 | 4.4 | 6.1 | 7.6 | 124 |
| 34. | 3.5 | 3.2 | 6.7 | 5.6 | 102 |
| 35. | 2.5 | 2.6 | 5.9 | 5.4 | 100 |
| 36. | 2.5 | 1.4 | 6.7 | 5.6 | 89 |
| 37. | 4.7 | 5.7 | 8.4 | 8.8 | 134 |
| 38. | 3.4 | 2.7 | 5.9 | 6.5 | 114 |
| 39. | 4.5 | 3.2 | 8.9 | 8.8 | 117 |
| 40. | 2.5 | 2.4 | 5.9 | 6.0 | 108 |
| 41. | 1.6 | 2.1 | 5.9 | 6.1 | 94 |
| 42. | 4.3 | 4.5 | 7.1 | 6.6 | 118 |

SAMPLE I (Continued)

| Subj. | ITBS 1979 | | ITBS 1982 | | Cog. Abil. 1979 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Voc. | Comp. | Voc. | Comp. | |
| 43. | 3.6 | 4.4 | 8.4 | 8.6 | 132 |
| 44. | 4.5 | 4.9 | 7.1 | 7.5 | 123 |
| 45. | 3.8 | 3.9 | 7.1 | 7.2 | 123 |
| 46. | 2.2 | 2.3 | 5.6 | 4.2 | 96 |
| 47. | 2.5 | 2.5 | 6.2 | 4.6 | 96 |
| 48. | 4.3 | 4.3 | 7.6 | 8.0 | 106 |
| 49. | 3.4 | 3.4 | 6.0 | 5.6 | 110 |
| 50. | 2.2 | 2.1 | 5.3 | 6.3 | 105 |
| 51. | 3.6 | 5.5 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 114 |

SAMPLE II

| Subj. | ITBS 1979 | | ITBS 1982 | | Cog. Abil. 1979 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Voc. | Comp. | Voc. | Comp. | |
| 1. | 3.0 | 3.1 | 6.7 | 6.1 | 103 |
| 2. | 4.5 | 5.2 | 6.9 | 7.3 | 118 |
| 3. | 3.2 | 2.8 | 6.2 | 6.4 | 104 |
| 4. | 5.0 | 5.5 | 7.6 | 8.0 | 130 |
| 5. | 1.6 | 3.0 | 5.5 | 6.2 | 100 |
| 6. | 3.5 | 3.2 | 5.6 | 6.8 | 105 |
| 7. | 4.5 | 4.9 | 8.4 | 8.6 | 116 |
| 8. | 3.9 | 3.7 | 7.3 | 6.9 | 117 |
| 9. | 4.1 | 4.4 | 6.7 | 7.8 | 91 |
| 10. | 3.0 | 2.4 | 4.9 | 6.0 | 97 |
| 11. | 3.8 | 3.6 | 6.7 | 6.1 | 119 |
| 12. | 3.4 | 3.4 | 5.9 | 5.4 | 100 |
| 13. | 3.5 | 3.3 | 6.4 | 6.6 | 106 |
| 14. | 2.2 | 2.6 | 5.3 | 5.6 | 97 |
| 15. | 3.2 | 2.6 | 6.4 | 5.7 | 94 |
| 16. | 3.2 | 4.0 | 6.7 | 8.0 | 113 |
| 17. | 2.7 | 2.3 | 5.5 | 5.2 | 86 |
| 18. | 5.0 | 5.2 | 8.4 | 10.0 | 127 |
| 19. | 3.9 | 5.0 | 6.9 | 7.6 | 114 |
| 20. | 4.3 | 4.8 | 7.3 | 7.6 | 111 |
| 21. | 4.7 | 4.7 | 6.9 | 7.3 | 112 |
| 22. | 5.0 | 5.0 | 7.6 | 8.2 | 119 |
| 23. | 3.9 | 5.3 | 6.2 | 7.6 | 119 |
| 24. | 4.3 | 5.0 | 8.4 | 9.0 | 124 |
| 25. | 4.7 | 5.2 | 8.0 | 7.6 | 133 |
| 26. | 4.5 | 5.7 | 8.4 | 7.0 | 127 |
| 27. | 4.3 | 5.9 | 7.3 | 8.0 | 123 |
| 28. | 2.8 | 2.0 | 5.8 | 5.2 | 93 |
| 29. | 4.1 | 4.7 | 7.6 | 8.0 | 106 |
| 30. | 2.7 | 1.9 | 5.5 | 6.2 | 92 |
| 31. | 4.5 | 5.5 | 8.9 | 7.5 | 123 |
| 32. | 3.6 | 4.8 | 6.9 | 7.2 | 100 |
| 33. | 6.1 | 4.8 | 7.6 | 8.4 | 133 |
| 34. | 3.0 | 3.1 | 5.6 | 5.7 | 92 |